



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No.	Filing Date	First Named Inventor	Atty. Docket No.
09/823,408	03/30/2001	ZABKA, J. Britton	08479-39460

Examiner
CHANG, Audrey Y.
Art Unit
2872

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION of 09/19/2002

In response to the Office Action of September 19, 2002, please amend the claims as follows:

1. (Twice Amended) A holographic printer comprising:
 - (a) a source of coherent light;
 - (b) means for dividing said source into an object beam and a reference beam, said object beam having a beam path, said reference beam having at least one beam path;
 - (c) means, positioned along said object beam path, for positioning an image in said object beam path;
 - (d) means for supporting a recording medium in both said object beam path and said reference beam path;
 - (e) means, positioned along said reference beam path between said dividing means and said recording medium support, for dividing said reference beam ~~plurality of~~ at least three substantially identical reference beams, each having its own path, each of said reference beam paths intersecting said object beam path at said recording medium support; and

(f) a plurality of shutter means, said plurality of shutter means including a shutter means positioned in said object beam path between said means for dividing and said recording medium support, said plurality of shutter means also including a shutter means for each of said ~~plurality of~~ at least three reference beams.

112 15. The printer of claim 14 1, further including shutter control means for controlling each of said plurality of shutter means, said shutter control means including means for sequentially opening each of said reference beam shutter means, said shutter control means also including means for opening also including means for opening said object beam shutter each time one of said reference beam shutter means is opened.

25. (Amended) The printer of claim 1, herein each of said ~~plurality of~~ at least three reference beams includes means for beam manipulation.

REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 30, 2002, Section 5, the Primary Examiner took the position that "claims 2-9, are drawn to *optical fiber*" and were a "patentably *distinct species* of the claimed invention." In the Response to that Office Action, Applicant stated:

Given that Applicant has restricted the claim 1 (as amended) to the embodiment schematically illustrated in Figure 9, Applicant requests that the Primary Examiner reconsider the election requirement between "distant species" (a) and (b) and also examine (with claims 1, 12, 15 and 16) claims 2-9.

Nowhere did the Applicant state or suggest that he was traversing "on the ground(s) that species II (claims 2-9) will not be operable without the amended feature of claim."